

Application No.: 10/740,201  
Amendment dated: December 13, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005  
Attorney Docket No.: 71379-015 (INTT-003)

### REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are currently pending in the present application, wherein claims 1, 18, 34 and 40 are independent claims. Claims 1-35, 37-38 and 40-43 have been amended herein for clarification. No new matter is presented by such amendments.

The restriction requirement asserts the original claims cover five distinct inventions, wherein Group I includes claims 1-11, Group II includes claims 12-17, Group III includes claims 18-33, Group IV includes claims 34-39 and Group V includes claims 40-43. We note that claims 16-23 will be examined with either of Group I or II if elected. Specifically, the Restriction Requirement states that :

Inventions II, III, IV, V, and I, are related as combination and subcombinations.

Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particular subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination (I) as claimed does not require subcombination (II) as claimed because distributing media content does not require the software linking content to topic, theme tracking, reconfiguring linkages, nor analyzing the data in real time, as claimed in subcombinations II, III, IV, and V. The subcombination (II) has separate utility such as the linking of the content based on the subject topic, the subcombination (III) has separate utility such as the tracking themes over time, the subcombination (IV) has separate utility such as the reconfiguration of levels based on cross-linking. Nor the subcombination (V) has separate utility such as the method of analyzing data in a real time. Therefore, the inventions are distinct; however, they could be usable together.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No.: 10/740,201  
Amendment dated: December 13, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005  
Attorney Docket No.: 71379-015 (INTT-003)

In accordance with its obligation, the Applicant elects Group I, claims 1-7 (and 16-23) for prosecution. This election is made with traverse. Applicant asserts that all Groups include the same core novel elements. Specifically, all claims require obtaining media content and creating links there between as a function of at least one tracked theme or topic. Each claims also requires updating the set of media content with new media content. These novel aspects appear in claim 1, and in each of independent claims 18, 34 and 40. Each independent claim has been amended to clarify this central point of novelty. As such, claims of Groups II-V cannot be practiced without practicing the method of claim 1. In this regard, claim 1 of Group I is a generic claim.

We note that independent claim 1, as amended, reads (with emphasis):

1. (amended) A linked information system, comprising:
  - A. a set of interfaces configured for enabling communication with a plurality of media content sources over at least one network;
  - B. at least one storage device coupled to the set of interfaces; and
  - C. one or more processors coupled to the at least one storage device and set of interfaces and configured to execute a set of linked information system logic comprising:
    - 1) content selection logic configured for obtaining from the media content sources a set of media content relevant to a field;
    - 2) linking logic configured for generating a set of links between media content from the set of media content as a function of a relevance to at least one tracked theme or topic within the field; and
    - 3) update logic configured for updating the set of media content, including incorporating new media content related to the at least one tracked theme or topic into the set of media content and adding, deleting or editing the set of links as a function of the new media content.

Independent claims 18, 34 and 40 include elements corresponding to those emphasized above in claim 1. Consequently, Applicant contends that each of claims 1, 18, 34 and 40 are not patentably distinct from each other – requiring restriction. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the restriction requirement and examination of all claims, in lieu of the election provided herein above.

The examiner is welcome to call the Applicant's undersigned attorney to discuss this matter or any other matter related to the subject application.


Application No.: 10/740.201  
Amendment dated: December 13, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005  
Attorney Docket No.: 71379-015 (INTT-003)

Beyond the fees for the requested extension of time, no other fees are believed due; however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-1133.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any aspect of this application or this response.

Date: December 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

  
David M. Mello, Reg. No. 43,799  
McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY LLP  
28 State Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-1775  
Tel. (617) 535-4037  
Fax: (617) 535-3800